

# JPR ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

**WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES? YOU DO! WE CAN HELP.**

## Voters! Finish the Ballot!

Use the following summary and report by the Commission on Judicial Performance Review (JPR) to Finish the Ballot! The JPR Commission was established by voters to evaluate judges' performance during retention elections. While judges initially are appointed, this report can help you decide whether these judges meet judicial performance standards and should be retained. Which judges appear on your ballot depends on your county and the court on which the judge serves. By using this report to finish your ballot, you will help ensure Arizona's strong and impartial judiciary!

## Read how some Arizona judges are appointed through Merit Selection and rated by the JPR Commission:

### Merit Selection and Retention

In 1974, Arizona voters decided that in counties with populations over 250,000 (currently Maricopa and Pima) and for Arizona's Supreme Court and Courts of Appeals, judges would be appointed by the Governor from a list of qualified candidates. The Arizona Constitution directs commissions to nominate candidates based primarily on their merit, with consideration given to the diversity of Arizona's population. Arizona voters then periodically vote whether to retain these judges as their terms expire. This system is known as Merit Selection and Retention.

### JPR Commission Evaluations & Report

Created by a constitutional amendment, the 30-member JPR Commission conducts standards-based performance evaluations of judges and reports these results. Most of the JPR Commission's members are not lawyers or judges. This report provides JPR Commission findings, survey results, and states whether each judge in a retention election "meets" or "fails to meet" judicial performance standards.

### Judicial Performance Standards

The JPR Commission evaluates each judge up for retention election to assess whether the judge:

- Administers justice fairly, ethically, uniformly, promptly and efficiently;
- Is free from personal bias when making decisions and decides cases based on the proper application of law;
- Issues prompt rulings that can be understood and makes decisions that demonstrate competent legal analysis;
- Acts with dignity, courtesy and patience; and
- Effectively manages his or her courtroom and the administrative responsibilities of the office.

### Public Input Throughout the Process

This year, as every election year, the JPR Commission sought public input and made its decisions using that input. Attorneys, jurors, litigants, witnesses, and other judges returned over 16,000 surveys on judges. The JPR Commission held public hearings open to anyone wishing to speak about the judges up for retention this year. The JPR Commission accepts signed, written comments about merit-appointed judges at any time.

Every voter can take an active role in this judicial review process; use this summary and report to guide your votes for judges up for retention. After reviewing a judge's information, mark "Yes" or "No" next to the judge's name on the Judge Checklist in the back of this pamphlet. Use this checklist to finish your ballot.

Visit [www.AZJudges.info](http://www.AZJudges.info) for more information.

Contact the Commission on Judicial Performance Review: (602) 452-3311  
or email [jpr@courts.az.gov](mailto:jpr@courts.az.gov)

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT AND COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE****RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE  
APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES AND JUDGES**

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***DO NOT MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT:**

Rebecca White Berch

**COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE:**

Daniel A. Barker

Michael J. Brown

John C. Gemmill

Philip L. Hall

Patrick Irvine

Jon W. Thompson

Lawrence F. Winthrop

**JUSTICE/JUDGE REVIEWS**

ALL ARIZONA VOTERS VOTE ON THE  
FOLLOWING SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

**BERCH, REBECCA WHITE**

Chief Justice

Appointed to the Arizona Supreme Court: 2002

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Chief Judge Responses</u></b> Surveys Distributed: 47 Surveys Returned: 26	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> Surveys Distributed: 601 Surveys Returned: 192	<b><u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u></b> Surveys Distributed: 43 Surveys Returned: 18
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	93%	100%
Integrity	100%	100%	98%
Communication Skills	100%	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**MARICOPA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE  
FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION I JUDGES**

**BARKER, DANIEL A.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2001

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 1,642 Surveys Returned: 377</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 394 Surveys Returned: 152</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	90%	93%
Integrity	96%	95%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	94%	95%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**GEMMILL, JOHN C.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2001

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 1,207 Surveys Returned: 333</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 284 Surveys Returned: 100</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	97%
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	87%	100%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**IRVINE, PATRICK**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2002

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 1,512 Surveys Returned: 382</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 370 Surveys Returned: 133</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	89%	100%
Integrity	97%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	94%	99%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**WINTHROP, LAWRENCE F.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2002

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 1,625 Surveys Returned: 261</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 291 Surveys Returned: 101</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	91%	96%
Integrity	99%	97%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	97%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**APACHE/COCONINO/LA PAZ/MOHAVE/NAVAJO/YAVAPAI/YUMA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE  
FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION I JUDGES**

**BROWN, MICHAEL J.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 625 Surveys Returned: 139</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 170 Surveys Returned: 60</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	87%	95%
Integrity	97%	97%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	91%	94%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**HALL, PHILIP L.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2001

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 1,516 Surveys Returned: 321</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 377 Surveys Returned: 128</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	92%	95%
Integrity	100%	98%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	92%	99%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**THOMPSON, JON W.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 1995

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 1,449 Surveys Returned: 341</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 377 Surveys Returned: 143</i>
<b>Legal Ability</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Communication Skills</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Administrative Performance</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>98%</b>
<b>Administrative Skills</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT – PIMA COUNTY VOTERS ONLY**

**RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION’S VOTE ON THE  
PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES**

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES **DO NOT MEET** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES **MEET** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

Borek, Ted B.  
Browning, Christopher C.  
Campoy, Hector E.  
Chandler, Terry  
Chon-Lopez, Javier  
Cruikshank, Michael  
Harrington, Charles V.  
Nichols, Richard D.

**PIMA COUNTY JUDGE REVIEWS**

**BOREK, TED B.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2000

26 Commissioners Voted “Meets”  
0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”

**Note: Judge Borek is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on his own performance finding.**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 219 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 35 Surveys Returned: 6</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 35 Surveys Returned: 13</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge “satisfactory”, “very good”, or “superior” in each of the Commission’s evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes “Yes” or “No” on whether a judge “MEETS” Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court’s website.

**BROWNING, CHRISTOPHER C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 203 Surveys Returned: 51</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 140 Surveys Returned: 32</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 45 Surveys Returned: 19</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	99%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	86%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**CAMPOY, HECTOR E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 109 Surveys Returned: 21</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 423 Surveys Returned: 67</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	91%	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**CHANDLER, TERRY**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2004

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 169 Surveys Returned: 36</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 137 Surveys Returned: 31</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 99 Surveys Returned: 29</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	98%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	99%	100%
Administrative Performance	94%	97%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**CHON-LOPEZ, JAVIER**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 113 Surveys Returned: 28</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 204 Surveys Returned: 44</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	98%	N/A
Communication Skills	94%	88%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	97%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	98%	N/A
Settlement Activities	88%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**CRUIKSHANK, MICHAEL**

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Family  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 53 Surveys Returned: 26</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 125 Surveys Returned: 45</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 143 Surveys Returned: 15</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	99%	88%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	99%	88%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	85%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	91%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	95%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HARRINGTON, CHARLES V.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 181 Surveys Returned: 76</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 146 Surveys Returned: 42</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	98%	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**NICHOLS, RICHARD D.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1995

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 207 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 115 Surveys Returned: 29</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 56 Surveys Returned: 26</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	99%
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT – MARICOPA COUNTY VOTERS ONLY**

**RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE  
MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES**

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES **DO NOT MEET** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES **MEET** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

Aceto, Mark F.	Foster, George H.	Martin, Daniel G.
Anderson, Aimee L.	Gaines, Pendleton	Mroz, Rosa P.
Anderson, Arthur T.	Gama, J. Richard	Myers, Samuel J.
Barton, Janet E.	Grant, Larry	Norris, Benjamin R.
Bassett, Edward W.	Granville, Warren J.	O'Connor, Karen L.
Bergin, Dawn M.	Hauser, Brian R.	Pineda, Susanna C.
Brodman, Roger E.	Hegyi, Hugh E.	Rayes, Douglas L.
Brotherton, William L.	Heilman, Joseph B.	Rea, John C.
Budoff, Robert	Hicks, Bethany G.	Reinstein, Peter C.
Burke, Edward O.	Hoag, M. Jean	Ronan, Emmet J.
Chavez, Harriett E.	Hyatt, Carey S.	Talamante, David M.
Davis, Norman J.	Ishikawa, Brian K.	Thumma, Samuel J.
Donahoe, Gary E.	Jones, Michael D.	Verdin, Maria del Mar
Duncan, Sally S.	Kreamer, Joseph C.	Warner, Randall H.
Fenzel, Alfred M.	Lee, Raymond	Welty, Joseph C.
Fink, Dean M.	Mangum, J. Kenneth	Willett, Eileen S.

**MARICOPA COUNTY JUDGE REVIEWS**

**ACETO, MARK F.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 114 Surveys Returned: 28</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 137 Surveys Returned: 26</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
<b><u>Legal Ability</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b> 93%	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b> N/A	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b> N/A
<b><u>Integrity</u></b>	94%	99%	N/A
<b><u>Communication Skills</u></b>	86%	100%	N/A
<b><u>Judicial Temperament</u></b>	79%	96%	N/A
<b><u>Administrative Performance</u></b>	90%	99%	N/A
<b><u>Settlement Activities</u></b>	80%	N/A	N/A
<b><u>Administrative Skills</u></b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**ANDERSON, AIMEE L.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 134 Surveys Returned: 39</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 380 Surveys Returned: 18</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	94%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	85%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**ANDERSON, ARTHUR T.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 169 Surveys Returned: 23</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 89 Surveys Returned: 9</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 42 Surveys Returned: 29</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	93%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**BARTON, JANET E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 204 Surveys Returned: 43</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 42 Surveys Returned: 6</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 34 Surveys Returned: 18</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	76%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	93%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	80%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	74%	80%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	94%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**BASSETT, EDWARD W.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2008

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 162 Surveys Returned: 45</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 369 Surveys Returned: 25</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	89%	N/A
Communication Skills	93%	80%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	91%	76%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	86%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**BERGIN, DAWN M.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 148 Surveys Returned: 40</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 96 Surveys Returned: 17</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	88%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	94%	94%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	82%	96%	N/A
Administrative Performance	94%	96%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**BRODMAN, ROGER E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 149 Surveys Returned: 43</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 522 Surveys Returned: 59</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	98%	N/A
Communication Skills	97%	92%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	88%	94%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**BROTHERTON, WILLIAM L.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"  
1 Commissioner Voted "Not Voting"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 112 Surveys Returned: 36</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 439 Surveys Returned: 35</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	84%	N/A
Communication Skills	90%	79%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	83%	78%	N/A
Administrative Performance	94%	85%	N/A
Settlement Activities	87%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**BUDOFF, ROBERT**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 329 Surveys Returned: 97</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 77 Surveys Returned: 17</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 27 Surveys Returned: 20</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**BURKE, EDWARD O.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 313 Surveys Returned: 72</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 35 Surveys Returned: 2</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 113 Surveys Returned: 28</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	100%	99%
Judicial Temperament	94%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	98%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**CHAVEZ, HARRIETT E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil; NW Presiding  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 4 Surveys Returned: 2</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 182 Surveys Returned: 56</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 205 Surveys Returned: 31</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 27 Surveys Returned: 25</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	99%	98%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	93%	94%	99%
Judicial Temperament	100%	96%	94%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	97%	95%	99%
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DAVIS, NORMAN J.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile; Associate Presiding  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 151 Surveys Returned: 63</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 42 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 54 Surveys Returned: 2</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	50%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	83%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DONAHOE, GARY E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal Presiding  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 57 Surveys Returned: 27</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 29 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 11 Surveys Returned: 8</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 104 Surveys Returned: 23</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	67%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	80%	100%	97%
Communication Skills	97%	67%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	67%	100%	99%
Administrative Performance	98%	83%	100%	99%
Settlement Activities	N/A	50%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	97%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**DUNCAN, SALLY S.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 240 Surveys Returned: 60</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 61 Surveys Returned: 10</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 58 Surveys Returned: 23</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	90%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	98%	100%
Communication Skills	89%	73%	100%
Judicial Temperament	87%	84%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	88%	100%
Settlement Activities	89%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FENZEL, ALFRED M.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 172 Surveys Returned: 67</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 423 Surveys Returned: 33</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	84%	N/A
Communication Skills	88%	80%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	89%	76%	N/A
Administrative Performance	91%	85%	N/A
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FINK, DEAN M.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 191 Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 24 Surveys Returned: 8</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 5</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	100%	76%
Communication Skills	94%	100%	80%
Judicial Temperament	95%	100%	80%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	80%
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**FOSTER, GEORGE H.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 175 Surveys Returned: 37</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 54 Surveys Returned: 3</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 81 Surveys Returned: 55</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	79%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	78%	100%	96%
Judicial Temperament	81%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	92%	100%	96%
Settlement Activities	69%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**GAINES, PENDLETON**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 192 Surveys Returned: 41</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 78 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 93 Surveys Returned: 55</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	88%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	86%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	89%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**GAMA, J. RICHARD**

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 31 Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 130 Surveys Returned: 19</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 7 Surveys Returned: 1</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	81%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	88%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	98%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	94%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	98%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**GRANT, LARRY**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 348 Surveys Returned: 84</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 58 Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 20 Surveys Returned: 16</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	81%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	90%	100%
Communication Skills	83%	90%	100%
Judicial Temperament	92%	91%	100%
Administrative Performance	89%	88%	100%
Settlement Activities	74%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**GRANVILLE, WARREN J.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 244 Surveys Returned: 62</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 56 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 68 Surveys Returned: 27</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	95%	100%
Communication Skills	93%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HAUSER, BRIAN R.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1991

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 236 Surveys Returned: 46</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 45 Surveys Returned: 3</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 18 Surveys Returned: 10</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**HEGYI, HUGH E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 197 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 22 Surveys Returned: 3</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 10 Surveys Returned: 6</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	76%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	50%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	67%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	78%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HEILMAN, JOSEPH B.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 199 Surveys Returned: 45</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 36 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 32 Surveys Returned: 10</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	85%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	72%	100%
Communication Skills	82%	78%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	80%	100%
Administrative Performance	81%	80%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HICKS, BETHANY G.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

15 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
12 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 453 Surveys Returned: 126</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 69 Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 37 Surveys Returned: 13</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	81%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	91%	100%
Communication Skills	82%	94%	100%
Judicial Temperament	89%	87%	100%
Administrative Performance	90%	94%	100%
Settlement Activities	84%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**HOAG, M. JEAN**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1996

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 115 Surveys Returned: 38</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 389 Surveys Returned: 41</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	92%	N/A
Communication Skills	93%	88%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	91%	87%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	92%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HYATT, CAREY S.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 89 Surveys Returned: 34</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 349 Surveys Returned: 28</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	86%	N/A
Communication Skills	97%	84%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	95%	83%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	87%	N/A
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**ISHIKAWA, BRIAN K.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Assoc. Presiding Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 22 Surveys Returned: 15</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 108 Surveys Returned: 33</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 435 Surveys Returned: 63</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	98%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	99%	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	98%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**JONES, MICHAEL D.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 192 Surveys Returned: 47</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 57 Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 12 Surveys Returned: 11</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**KREAMER, JOSEPH C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 244 Surveys Returned: 71</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 52 Surveys Returned: 9</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 47 Surveys Returned: 25</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**LEE, RAYMOND**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

22 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
5 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 96 Surveys Returned: 25</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 102 Surveys Returned: 9</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	97%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	71%	96%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**MANGUM, J. KENNETH**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1991

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 207 Surveys Returned: 64</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 46 Surveys Returned: 9</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 16 Surveys Returned: 5</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	79%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	88%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	95%	100%
Administrative Performance	95%	96%	100%
Settlement Activities	92%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**MARTIN, DANIEL G.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 94 Surveys Returned: 26</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 235 Surveys Returned: 37</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 35 Surveys Returned: 9</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	95%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	92%	100%
Judicial Temperament	94%	93%	100%
Administrative Performance	93%	97%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**MROZ, ROSA P.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 139 Surveys Returned: 29</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 65 Surveys Returned: 21</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 36 Surveys Returned: 23</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	99%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	97%
Settlement Activities	89%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**MYERS, SAMUEL J.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 166 Surveys Returned: 48</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 94 Surveys Returned: 23</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 55 Surveys Returned: 55</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	92%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	95%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**NORRIS, BENJAMIN R.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2008

24 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
3 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 130 Surveys Returned: 34</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 279 Surveys Returned: 18</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	85%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	91%	94%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	91%	97%	N/A
Administrative Performance	75%	96%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**O'CONNOR, KAREN L.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Probate  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 5 Surveys Returned: 2</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 54 Surveys Returned: 18</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 74 Surveys Returned: 17</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 36 Surveys Returned: 17</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	90%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	99%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	98%	96%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	92%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	98%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**PINEDA, SUSANNA C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 138 Surveys Returned: 37</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 170 Surveys Returned: 20</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 24 Surveys Returned: 3</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	89%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	84%	89%
Judicial Temperament	97%	87%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	86%	89%
Settlement Activities	89%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**RAYES, DOUGLAS L.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 457 Surveys Returned: 109</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 54 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 8 Surveys Returned: 8</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**REA, JOHN C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 281 Surveys Returned: 63</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 48 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 46 Surveys Returned: 32</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**REINSTEIN, PETER C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 169 Surveys Returned: 41</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 388 Surveys Returned: 19</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	87%	N/A
Communication Skills	88%	64%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	79%	65%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	78%	N/A
Settlement Activities	87%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**RONAN, EMMET J.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 169 Surveys Returned: 38</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 77 Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 65 Surveys Returned: 23</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	100%	94%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	94%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	96%
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	96%
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**TALAMANTE, DAVID M.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family; SE Presiding  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 17 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 180 Surveys Returned: 45</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 254 Surveys Returned: 32</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	99%	96%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	96%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	99%	95%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	97%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	96%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**THUMMA, SAMUEL A.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 138 Surveys Returned: 37</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 246 Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	99%	93%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	96%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**VERDIN, MARIA DEL MAR**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Note: Judge Verdin is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on her own performance finding.			
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 155 Surveys Returned: 38</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 134 Surveys Returned: 18</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 56 Surveys Returned: 16</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	98%
Judicial Temperament	92%	97%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**WARNER, RANDALL H.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Associate Presiding Family

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 37 Surveys Returned: 15</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 139 Surveys Returned: 52</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 262 Surveys Returned: 14</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	N/A	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	95%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	97%	85%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	96%	92%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	92%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	97%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**WELTY, JOSEPH C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 241 Surveys Returned: 49</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 140 Surveys Returned: 12</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 65 Surveys Returned: 39</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	95%	100%
Judicial Temperament	95%	98%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	94%	99%
Settlement Activities	97%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**WILLETT, EILEEN S.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 167 Surveys Returned: 46</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 42 Surveys Returned: 6</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 48 Surveys Returned: 22</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	84%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	90%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	91%	89%	100%
Settlement Activities	75%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

**FOOTNOTE:** The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.